



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,355	12/09/2003	Jose Arno	ATMI 567-Div-Con-3	3545
25559	7590	06/27/2006	EXAMINER	
ATMI, INC. 7 COMMERCE DRIVE DANBURY, CT 06810			STEVENSON, ANDRE C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2812	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/731,355

Applicant(s)

ARNO, JOSE

Examiner

Andre' C. Stevenson

Art Unit

2812

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 6-10.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.


MICHAEL LEBENTRITT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's Argument: In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that (1) Tanaka is non-analogous art with respect to Sorensen and Applicant's claimed invention; (2) there is no motivation to combine Tannkn with Sorensen; (3) even if combined the imaging system of Tanaka would fail in the plasma deposition chamber environment disclosed in Sorensen; (4) without appreciation of Applicant's own invention, there has been an unsuccessful attempt to use impermissible hindsight reconstruction to combine Tanaka with Sorensen; (5) as acknowledged in the Final Office Action, Sorensen does not disclose transmission of the infrared beam through the sampling region" and Tanaka fails to rectify that deficiency of Sorensen, and (6) even if the imaging system of Tanaka could be placed in the plasma deposition chamber of Sorensen, it would be placed on the backside of substrate 10 - and œq such, arguably any infrared beam would not pass through substrate 10.

Examiner's Answer: Applicant's arguments filed April 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner directs the Applicant to column #5, lines 53-67 and column #6, lines 1-30, as well as the cited sections in the previous rejections, of the Tanaka patent. The Examiner takes the position that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, with respect to claim #1, to include the step having a transmission of a infrared beam through a sampling region, into the method of Sorensen, as taught by Tanaka, with the motivation that having the infrared imaging system, when used to recognizes a defective pixel detection mode in response to a predetermined signal supplied from an external source, produces a normal image signal that is free of defective image data from defective pixels, as stated by Tanaka in the cited sections. For the this reason, the Examiner takes the position that the rejection is proper. .